



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MORE OF THE PEACE CONGRESS AT FRANKFORT.

THE limits of our last number would not allow us to complete even the brief abstract we proposed to give of this Congress; and we now add a few more items from its proceedings, and such notices of it by the press as may suffice for a just record of the light in which it is regarded, not only by professed friends of peace, but by the mass of intelligent and fair-minded men throughout the Old World.

MORE LETTERS TO THE CONGRESS.

VICTOR HUGO, *President of the Congress at Paris in 1849.* — I considered it both a duty and a pleasure, this year as well as the last, to take my seat among you at the Peace Congress, which, to my mind, appears to be the holy table of the communion of nations.

The state of my health, injured by the fatigue of much public speaking, compels me to forego that happiness. Between the labors of the session which has just closed, and the probable struggles of the forthcoming one, my medical advisers oblige me to take repose. Nevertheless, — and I do not say so for myself alone, but for you also, — you, conscientious, persevering, and religious men! — our physical strength may become exhausted; but that which is in us inextinguishable is our devotedness to humanity, our ardor for universal conciliation, our profound faith in that Divine Legislator, who, when expiring on the cross, dropped from his hands these two laws for futurity, — LIBERTY, the law for man; and PEACE, the law for nations.

The Peace Congress, towards which the eyes of the whole world are turned, and which the great minds of the day applaud, even now possesses the vitality and the potency of an institution; indeed, it is already an institution. It is the germ of that great convention of the nations which some day, perhaps soon, will decide peaceably the fate of the world, will dissolve international hatreds, consecrate all nationalities, by attaching them to a superior unity. Above our sad assemblies, struggling amidst the storms of selfish passion, and the tumultuous interests of the present, the Peace Congress shines like the assembly of the future.

Continue, gentlemen, your teaching, which has all the solemnity of the pulpit; every discourse of yours will be a commentary upon the gospel. Yes! you are forming the future; doubt it not. Happy they who will be able to say, "We have seen the last scaffold, and the last of the wars!" for they will also have seen the last of the revolutions.

I address you from the bottom of my heart; or let me say, rather, I renew my adhesion. Receive it as I send it. All, just as we now are, whatever the languages we speak, to what nation soever we belong — German, French, English, Italian, Belgian, European, or American — we are all alike men, we have the same soul, we own the same God, we have one common destiny, and one common future — countrymen on earth; brethren in heaven!

FREDERICK BASTIAT. — An affection of the throat, under which I am suffering, would not have sufficed to keep me away from the Congress, because my part would have been rather to hear than to speak, if I had not submitted myself to a treatment which obliges me to remain at Paris. Penetrated with a sense of what is great and novel in this spectacle of men of all races and all languages, coming together from every point of the globe, to labor in common for the triumph of Universal Peace, it is with

zeal, with enthusiasm, that I would have joined my efforts to yours in so holy a cause.

In truth, Universal Peace is considered by many as a chimera, and consequently the Congress as an effort, honorable indeed, but impracticable. This feeling reigns, perhaps, more in France than anywhere, because it is the country which has been most wearied with Utopianisms, and where ridicule is most dreaded. If I could have spoken to the Congress, I should have addressed myself to rectify this false appreciation.

Without doubt, there has been a time when a Congress of Peace would have had no chance of success. When men made war to acquire booty, or territory, or slaves, it would have been difficult to have arrested them by moral or economical considerations. Even religion itself has failed. But to-day, two circumstances have altogether changed the question.

The first is, that war has no interest to plead, as a cause, or even as a pretext, being always contrary to the true interest of the masses. The second is, that it is no longer dependent on the caprice of a chief, but on public opinion. From the combination of these two circumstances, it follows that war must become more and more rare, and finally disappear, by the mere force of events, even independently of all intervention of the Congress; for a fact which injures the public, and is yet dependent on the public, must necessarily cease.

What, then, is the work of the Congress? It is to hasten a conclusion already inevitable, in showing, to those who have not yet seen it, in what way, and to what extent, war and great armaments injure the general interests. And is there anything Utopian in such a mission?

During the last few years, the world has passed through circumstances, which, certainly, at another epoch, would have produced long and cruel wars. Why have they been avoided? Because, if there be in Europe a war party, there are also the friends of Peace. If there are men always ready to fight, whom a stupid education has imbued with antique ideas, and barbarous prejudices, which attach honor only to animal courage, and see no glory except in military achievements; there are, happily, other men at the same time more religious, more moral, more wise, and provident calculators. Is it not very natural that the latter should endeavor to make proselytes among the former? How many times has civilization, as in 1830, in 1840, in 1848, been suspended, so to speak, on this question, Who shall prevail, the party of War, or the party of Peace? Hitherto, the Peace party has triumphed; and it must be acknowledged, not perhaps by its numbers or its ardor, but because it had the political influence. Thus Peace and War are dependent upon opinion, and opinion is divided. And thus there is a danger always imminent. In these circumstances, does not the Congress undertake a work which is useful, sober, efficacious, — I will even dare to say, easy, when it strives to strengthen the pacific opinion, so as in the end to give it a decisive preponderance? What is there chimerical in this? If we had said to mankind, 'We come to summon you to trample your own interests under foot, to act henceforth on a mere principle of duty, of sacrifice, of self-denial,' I fear, alas! that the enterprise would have been very doubtful.

But we come, on the contrary, to say to them, 'Consult not only the interest of another life, but even of this. Examine the effects of war. See if they are not most disastrous. See if war, and great standing armaments, do not produce interruption of labor, paralysis of industry, waste of resources, crushing debts, heavy taxation, financial impossibilities, discontents and revolutions, without taking into account the deplorable immoral habits they produce, and the culpable violation of the laws of religion.'

May we not be permitted to hope that this language will be listened to? Courage, then, men of faith and devotion! Courage and confidence!

Those who cannot, to-day, mingle with your ranks, follow you with their eyes and their hearts.

EFFECT OF STANDING ARMIES ON PEACE.

PREPARATIONS FOR WAR INCENTIVES TO WAR: *a Speech by M. JOSEPH GARNIER, of Paris, at the Frankfort Congress.* — “Most of those,” says the London Herald of Peace, “who are conversant with the Peace Congress movement, are now sufficiently familiar with the name of M. Garnier, the very able and zealous Secretary for France, both at Paris and Frankfort. We know of no one among our Continental fellow-laborers who has taken hold of Peace principles with more earnest and resolute conviction than this gentleman, or who has a more thorough understanding of the whole question, in all its intricate and delicate relations. It is no small triumph to have gained the cordial and devoted adhesion of such a man, who, by the temper of his mind, and the character of his studies, is as far as possible removed from being a mere, unreasoning enthusiast. He is on the contrary distinguished by habits of severe thought, and a hardy, vigorous, precise logic. No stronger homage to the sterling merits of M. Garnier’s speech could be obtained or desired, than the following testimony, reluctantly extorted from the sneering correspondent of the *Times*, to whom indeed the establishment at Printing-house-square might almost address the reproach which Balak did to Balaam, — ‘I sent thee to curse mine enemies, and lo! thou hast blessed them altogether.’ ‘The Gallic star of to-day,’ says this writer, ‘was decidedly M. Garnier, one of the Secretaries of the Congress, whose clear enunciation and very logical form created universal admiration. He laid it down as his fundamental proposition, that a standing army is the cause of war, and carried on his reasoning with a precision so great, that it might almost be called pedantic. * * * The neat, close speech of M. Garnier, gained not a little by comparison with sundry rambling orations.’ ”

M. Garnier, on the resolution before the Congress, in favor of “international disarmament,” or a large but gradual reduction of standing armies through the civilized world, spoke as follows: —

“Those persons who have not sufficiently studied the great question of Peace, reproach us with losing ourselves in a vain philanthropy, or impracticable religious aspirations, instead of addressing ourselves directly to the causes of war. That objection is not just; for it is really the investigation into the causes of war, and of the means by which those causes may be removed, that form the object of our deliberations in this Congress, and in all the meetings which have preceded it. Look at our programme. Look at the resolutions carried yesterday. Do not the proposals that have been submitted to you refer to the causes of war, and suggest the means for destroying, or at least, for mitigating those causes? Does not the proposition which we are discussing at this moment indicate at once that the great armaments are one permanent cause of war between nations, and that international disarmament is the natural, necessary, indispensable remedy for the evil?”

Gentlemen, there are four general causes for war; religious interests — the interests of reigning families — the economical, industrial, commercial interests of the nations — and a narrow spirit of nationality, producing the great armaments. Religious war no longer exists. It is true that one of the great powers of Europe has recently committed the error of reinstating by force of arms the head of the Catholic religion; but if we go to the bottom of matters, we shall find, that in that intervention, religion was not generally taken as the pretext, and that the most real and apparent motives

were ideas of Dignity, Influence, Preponderance, and similar reasons, that are wont to be used by those who wish to lead one nation to meddle in the affairs of another. If we ask those who voted the subsidies for that unjust and deplorable war, it will be found that they had not even any precise perception themselves of the reasons by which they were guided. Very certainly, most of them had something far other in view than the interests of Catholicism; and I see here an advance on the fanaticism which would have inspired the representatives of the intervening nation at another epoch. In our days religion is better understood; it is well known, that it is possible to employ other means for making progress in the divine path; all religious sects every day abandon more and more the means of hate and war, and have recourse more and more to means of conciliation and brotherhood. The remarkable composition of this Congress is one proof of what I have advanced.

Thanks to the improvement that has taken place in constitutional and representative institutions through all Europe, the second cause of war which I mentioned is becoming more feeble day by day. Before a Government can make war for the interest of a dynasty, or a small number of families, it must have the consent of those who bear the cost; and this consent cannot be obtained until you have convinced the tax-payers that this family interest is also national, and that the national interest is in accordance with honor, with right, with justice, and with duty. And this is a result which it becomes more difficult every day to secure, even for the most aristocratic Governments to obtain; for they also have need to be supported by public opinion, by means of which is accomplished that moral progress which is the law of our nature.

Absurd economical and commercial prejudices still inspire the diplomats, the legislators, and the Governments of our own time; but if those prejudices are of the same nature as those of preceding ages, they differ sensibly in force and intensity, since the hundred years that the foundations of political economy were laid. This rational science of interests has not ceased to advance, by the labor of thinkers and philosophers, and sometimes also by the efforts of statesmen, such as Surgot, Huskisson, Sir Robert Peel. This science, though excluded from the system of public instruction by certain states, does not the less act, by means of the weighty truths it develops, on international relations — it does not the less weaken every day the prejudices which have produced those commercial shackles, from which the nations feel in our day the necessity to disembarass themselves. On certain points, political economy can yet speak only in problems; but on many others, the light has been shed by masters, whose names are venerated, and whose authority is respected, by all educated men throughout Europe. In the number of these points completely elucidated, and altogether resolved, we must place the rules that ought to preside over the economical relations of the peoples to the greatest advantage of their agriculture, their industries, their commerce, their capitalists, and their laborers. Economical science, which M. Droz has called the best auxiliary to morality, which is also the best auxiliary to the cause we are now defending, and for the diffusion of which the friends of Peace cannot make too strenuous efforts — economical science overturns from top to bottom the prejudices by which a whole multitude of wars have been justified in times past, the same prejudices which are invoked even yet in our days.

Interpreting these prejudices, Montaigne has said, that 'the loss of one nation is the profit of another.' Here we have a barbarous axiom, which has never been true, but which political economy has demonstrated to be contrary to the truth. That which is true — that which represents the interests of peoples as well as of individuals, is, that the profit of one is the profit of the other; that the loss of the one is the loss of the other. Observe only

what has taken place within the last few years. Have you not seen that the distress of one has been the distress of the others ; that a crisis among one people has produced a crisis among the others ; that the diminution of the imports has corresponded to that of the exports ; that the sufferings of nations in revolution, have made themselves felt among those that were tranquil ; that the misery of the laborers has impoverished the capitalists, and that the losses of the latter have weighed heavily on the former ? What does all this say, if not the direct converse of what Montaigne said, that the loss of one is the profit of the others ; but very much on the contrary, that the detriment of one is the detriment of the other, as the profit of one is the profit of the other ?

I do not wish to speak here of the exciting question of nationalities ; but may I not say, that if you remove from those antipathies which have divided the peoples, and which have too often been honored with the name of patriotism, that which has been owing to religious influence, or to the interests more or less extended of dynasties and oligarchies, or to economical prejudices, and if you take into account the effects produced by the extension of the means of communication, by rapidity of correspondences, by the study of languages, the constant blending together of men and of things, that the problem of nationalities has been prodigiously simplified ?

There remains, then, gentlemen, only the last cause of war, which I have specified — the great armaments against which this resolution is proposed. It is of the essence of armies to provoke war, as it is of the essence of the storm-clouds to produce thunder and tempest. As often as you have seen armies of observation amassed on any point, in order to prevent war, you have seen diplomatic complications, and war has most frequently followed *ipso facto*. Nothing more natural. While armies exist, it is necessary to justify their being maintained ; they must be made useful ; and, in order to be made useful, they must seek for some quarrel, or become the cause of quarrel to others, that they may have recourse to gun-shot and cannon-shot, by which means the utility of regiments may be demonstrated.

The members of this Congress know, as well as others, what are the qualities which may develop themselves in military condition ; and they also take great account of the courage, the devotion, the sacrifices, the sentiments of humanity, of which military men may sometimes give illustrious examples. But these are only choice and exceptional characters, among whom the noble qualities of the soul may be displayed, even through their fearful calling. But the mass, under that deleterious influence, obey their evil instincts ; in time of war, they accustom themselves to glut their love of cruelty ; they kill, they plunder, they violate, like barbarians, or the brute beasts of whom the eloquent Mr. Burnet spoke yesterday. In time of peace, they are delivered up to the ravages of idleness and demoralization, which corrupt not only themselves, but the populations in the midst of whom they live.

And while on this subject, permit me to mention a painful impression which I received this very morning, in observing one of the effects of this demoralizing influence of standing armies. This morning, at the sound of military music, I opened my window to see a detachment of Prussian soldiers defile ; and what did I see ? A band of little Frankfort children marching after the drums, and eagerly imbibing, here as in Paris, and as in all garrisoned towns, military prejudices, getting accustomed to the view of armies destined to slaughter men, and familiarizing themselves with the idea of war, and the extermination of their fellow-men. That was a pernicious education which has more of power than we imagine, and which is also the fountain-head of the prejudices which we have to destroy.

I shall only say one word on the economical effects of maintaining these armies that ruin Europe. One of the most laborious and learned

men in Germany, M. de Reden, has distributed among you a pamphlet, directed in part against our agitation, but in which I find a strong argument in support of your cause. M. de Reden has calculated, that one-half of the young men in Europe are occupied in the armies. Here we have, then, one-half of the living force of the population, which not only produce nothing for themselves, their children, their aged parents, and their wives, but who destroy a large quantity of the wealth destined either for reproduction, or for the maintenance of the population. Now, when we speak of the destruction of wealth and capital, we speak at the same time of the diminution of labor and of consequent misery. For with what shall we prevent misery — with what shall we relieve it — with what cause it to disappear, if not with labor and capital? Thus, then, the system of standing armies has for its direct effect, War, which is the extermination of men, and for its indirect effect, Misery, which is only another species of extermination.

If this is true, the natural conclusion, the necessary conclusion, the common-sense conclusion, is, that the Governments of those nations which pride themselves on marching in the van of civilization, ought to renounce this ruinous and degrading system; no longer augment their armaments, but, on the contrary, progressively diminish their army and their navy. I speak of a progressive diminution, in order to keep myself within the limits of that which is naturally acceptable and practicable; but I believe in the possibility, at a future time, of an absolute disarmament. Not that I dream of the absolute perfection of our species; but that I hope communities will learn, while advancing in the path of progress, to constitute in a manner less vicious the public force which may be necessary for the maintenance of tranquillity, and as a sanction to the decisions of justice. Here, I know, an objection will present itself to the minds of many among you, especially of those who inhabit countries where political events have let loose the dangerous passions, and shaken the foundations of social order—an objection which I do not wish to evade. Armies, I shall be told, very considerable armies are necessary to compress those passions, to defend the liberties of all, to re-assure society. In the first place, I fear greatly, for my part, and God grant that I may be mistaken! that very soon the public liberties may be obliged to defend themselves against this kind of protection. In the second place, even admitting, by way of hypothesis, that the great armaments are justified by the events which have occurred since 1848, there is at least one proportion of them subsisting in view of foreign hostilities, against which it is that we address our strictures. In the third place, revolutions are fevers which last only for a time, and we may hope, that the greatness of the crisis is past, that the peoples are again resuming the gait of pacific progress, that evil passions are becoming calmed, that we are about to enter into the normal condition before 1848; and thus, as our efforts are not those of circumstance, and have a permanent and universal object, our arguments are still applicable to the greater part of the armaments throughout all Europe.

Besides, gentlemen, remark well, that the agitations, on which is based the necessity of great armaments, have for the most part their origin in the sufferings and abuses which would disappear, as the consequence of that diminution of charges, of those financial improvements and economical reforms, which are possible only with and through disarmament. If then, you admit the idea, on one side, of a large reduction in the national budgets by the adoption of the system we recommend, and, on the other, of an intelligent readjustment of commercial legislation, and other economical laws, you will augment the resources of States, and the productiveness of industries, and diminish, by the very same means, the causes of agitation, the influence of evil passions, and the pretended necessity of great armaments for maintaining the public tranquillity.

These reasons, and many others, confirm me in the conviction, that we are not so Utopian as some would wish to assure us; that we are, on the contrary, most practical in demanding, that to the system of armed peace, which has cost so much, and succeeded so badly for the last eighteen years, there should succeed a system of true peace — a system of peace disarmed.⁷

COMMENTS BY THE PRESS.

INFLUENCE OF THE CONGRESS ON THE GERMAN MIND. — *London Hera'd of Peace.* — It is clear enough that the Peace Movement has now attained to such a conspicuous altitude, that none even of those to whom its principles and objects are most unwelcome, can affect, as they once did, to ignore its existence, or pass it by as undeserving of notice. For several weeks the proceedings at Frankfort occupied a foremost place in the records and discussions of the newspaper press throughout all the most civilized countries of Europe, and the question of permanent international peace was thus forced on the attention of myriads of men to whom it might otherwise have never occurred. Apart, therefore, from all other results, this of itself is an advantage of incalculable value; for an idea like ours, possessing in itself an inherent grandeur and nobleness, adapted to stir the intellect and touch the hearts of the best portion of our species everywhere, cannot have been thus cast upon the wings of the wind, and borne to the four corners of heaven, without giving rise to many thoughts, feelings, and aspirations, which will manifest their presence and power hereafter by consequences both extended and most salutary. On the mind of Germany itself, we have no doubt the impression will be both profound and permanent. They are not so easily stirred to enthusiasm as our more vivacious and impressible neighbors on the other side of the Channel. But when a principle has been once fairly deposited in the German soil, it will probably take far deeper root than it would in France. We cannot doubt, indeed, that though, owing to temporary and local circumstances, many persons in that country held back from participating in the proceedings of the Congress — the *idea* itself on which the Congress was founded is eminently adapted, from its vastness and novelty, to take hold on the daring and speculative genius of Germany. That it has already excited great interest, and set in motion that wonderful mental and literary activity for which our neighbors are distinguished, is strikingly proved by a fact mentioned to us by Dr. Creiznach, before our departure from Frankfort: — “*That, even then, just six days after the assembly had closed, no fewer than eight pamphlets had already appeared from the press, to discuss the question in its various aspects, and with different degrees of favor.*”

London Non-Conformist. — We shall not trouble our readers just now with any disquisition on the subject of peace, nor with congresses similar to that held last week at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. We judge it to be more suitable, now that the sittings of the Congress are over, and seeing that we have enjoyed a fair opportunity of observing the character of the proceedings, and the kind of effect they have produced, to give, in as few sentences as possible, and with perfect candor, such a running comment upon what has come under our notice, as may serve to assist our readers in forming a correct opinion on the general result which this visit of the friends of peace has produced, or is likely to produce, on the German mind.

That the attention of the German people has been called to the subject under circumstances calculated not only to arrest it, but also to start in their minds new trains of reflection, not a few incidents have tended to prove. To speak in the most moderate and guarded terms, the Frankfort Peace

Congress has been no failure. It was impossible to see, day after day, the immense audience assembled within St. Paul's Church, and the crowds which stood at the different entrances in the Platz without — it was impossible to watch the interchange of cordial greeting between the foreigners and the inhabitants of the place, or to notice the tone of respect in which the local journals referred to the proceedings — it was impossible to have been there during the three days' sittings of the Congress, and to have used one's eyes and ears, without being convinced that, much as remains to be done to permeate the mind of Germany with sentiments hostile to war, a most hopeful beginning has been made, and the seeds of truth have been committed to the soil under flattering auspices. To the men of Germany the whole question is a new one. Their ready assent to the views placed before them was hardly to be desired, and certainly was not to be expected. It is enough — it is a full vindication of all the expense and fatigue which have been incurred, that the subject of peace has been brought before the German people for the first time, in such a manner as to have engaged their respectful notice, and as will insure their discussion of its claims, and earnest reflection on its merits.

The three days' sittings were characterised by unbroken order. We have never, on any occasion, attended a similar gathering, in which so little occurred to awaken anxiety, so little to be followed by regret. As M. Emile de Girardin observed, in proposing a vote of thanks to the President, the governments of Europe might learn a profitable lesson from what had taken place within St. Paul's church, Frankfort, during the sessions of the Congress. Here were men speaking different languages, entertaining different political sentiments, believing in different religious creeds, and sprung from different origins in regard to race, all harmonizing in one common centre, and discussing with perfect freedom, but without the slightest disturbance of fraternal sympathies, a question in which all took the liveliest interest — a strong illustration of the wisdom of leaving to people, under all circumstances, the right of free discussion, and the privilege of self-regulation. All was grave, earnest, and orderly. There was comparatively little fine speaking. Mere oratory seemed out of place. But there was something much better, much more likely to yield salutary and lasting results, namely, a prevailing desire to make what was said tell most effectively upon the end to be accomplished. We could not help thinking, as we listened to what was uttered, that if these men were mad, they had "method in their madness." Their enthusiasm put on an appearance which common sense could not repudiate — their unpracticalness was exhibited in strikingly practical lights. Of course, there will be many who will laugh at the whole affair, and who will utter for the thousandth time the cuckoo cry of Utopianism; but we venture to say that their laughter will be feigned and hollow, unless like idiots, they laugh from sheer vacancy. Cutting a canal, or constructing a railroad, offers about as appropriate a theme for the ridicule of the intelligent, as any of the proceedings of the Frankfort Peace Congress.

Independently of the direct purpose of the Congress, it has elicited in one form or another, acts of courtesy, and manifestations both of good will and of individual self-sacrifice, which cannot but produce a beneficial effect. The liberality of the burgomasters and senate of Frankfort, in giving a ready and unconditional permission to the holding of these meetings in their free city, at a time, too, when the political affairs of Germany are in a critical position — the magnanimity with which the Lutheran Consistory granted the use of St. Paul's Church, never occupied till now for any purpose since the dispersion of the German Parliament — the facilities afforded by the several authorities through whose territories the British deputation had to pass, in dispensing with the usual formalities of passports and Custom-

house inspection, amongst which authorities we are desired to make special and honorable mention of Chevalier Bunsen, the ambassador, and Count Perpancher, chargé d'affaires of the Prussian Government in London — the hospitality displayed by some of the leading inhabitants of Frankfort, and the kindly feeling expressed on both sides — these are things which go far to beget reciprocal respect and attachment, and to lay a foundation for future sympathy and brotherhood. It is thus that those feelings are begotten which constitute the best guarantee for the permanence of peace, and the influence of such things will be, to foster ties which governments will find it difficult, if not impossible, to snap asunder. In the language of one of the German speakers, we are not without hope, that Frankfort will have cause to look back upon the three days of the Peace Congress as the three happiest days for her which she has ever known.

Preston Guardian. — During the past week, the friends and promoters of international peace have been holding their annual Congress at Frankfort-on-the-Maine. Their assemblage this year has been unprecedentedly numerous and influential, comprising two thousand representatives and attendants from all parts of the world; and among these, many literary, religious, and political celebrities of the age. It would be vain to deny the importance of a subject which can convene an assemblage of this magnitude and character, or to question the influence which the event itself must have upon the different Governments of the civilized world. The myrmidons of the war system, backed by a venal portion of the press, may affect to despise these annual demonstrations of a few “sentimentalists in drab,” as the *Times* facetiously designates the advocates of Peace; but just as surely as self-interest and sarcasm failed to prevent the triumph of the Anticorn-law League, so surely will the peace movement, which has still higher principles for its impulse, and still ampler benefits to mankind for its object, quickly ripen into a “great fact,” and become practically recognized in the policy of nations.

London Daily News. — If assemblies of men were to be ridiculed and scouted, because they merely debated and expressed opinion, without coming to any practical end, we fear that parliaments and senates and synods would have but rare chances of meeting with respect. After all, the most practicable thing that even venerable parliaments do, is to advance and enlighten opinion. For this must be awakened and matured even in our own country, before Parliament can venture to pass a final decision or vote. Such has been the progress of most questions with us; years of talk — mere talk — put forth like annual leaves, the fruit not appearing till after the lapse of perhaps a quarter of a century. To test the truth of this, we have but to examine the progress of all great questions among us — electoral reform, abolition of slavery, Catholic emancipation, or free trade. * * It is a great matter that these ideas, — that is, the superiority of moral force in obtaining the rights of nations, — should not germinate in the minds of the people alone, or ferment in the breasts of one or two isolated countries. What is most to be desired is, that grave, reflecting, eminent, benevolent, and pacific men, should show themselves as entertaining these views, or devoting themselves to these ideas, so that the great work of progress and reform should not be left to local demagogues or class malcontents, but that the people should feel there was a mass of superior and philosophic minds caring for them.

London Christian Times. — A few years ago, scarcely half a dozen persons in Great Britain had ever heard of the famous project of HENRI QUATRE, to supersede armies by courts of arbitration for nations. Now the Peace

Society has an auxiliary in all our towns. The idea of words instead of swords has grown into a theory, to which millions of thinking, moral, and courageous men, are willing to commit themselves for ever. Truly, the progress of an idea is a romantic thing. Within a generation past, nearly all men believed in the right of fighting — the comic art of preserving peace by breaking it — of *compelling* men to think, to feel, and to resolve. * * * We can scarcely conceive of an event of more importance to the real welfare of Germany than the insignificant convention, as the *Times* chooses to consider it, of the friends of peace in Frankfort. Of all lands, Germany has been most frequently ridden by the warrior and his masters — the petty despots under the huger absolutism of Vienna. But if the German mind once grasp the idea of pacification for the world, there will be an end of government by dragons.

London Chronicle.— So long has the world bowed before armed sway, that, with the force of superstition, the idea has seized hold on men's minds that there is no security for peace, but in readiness for war; no safety for States but in armies. The common belief has come to be, that men can be ruled only by terror; that artillery is the true divine right of kings. Be it so; be it that man has not yet risen above the reign of force — that reason has as yet brought him no further than the battle-field — that industry must still with work-worn hand pay taxes in peace to maintain the forces and muniments of war; still it is surely a lesson worthy of being taught, that there is the higher security attainable of peace founded upon the common international and individual interests of all mankind. * * * It is difficult to understand, why, on this subject alone, experience should fail to teach why men, who have learned readily enough to rid themselves from fever by draining the marshes, and from plague and cholera by cleanliness and extra-mural burial of the dead, should be utterly unteachable, that they may rid themselves of ruinous taxation by mutually laying down their arms. * * * Truth even in plainest shape is slow of growth. Not this Peace Congress nor the next may wake the nations from their dream of safety under armies. But we know of no more noble subject to gather men together, or send them forth as missionaries throughout the world, than this of universal peace.

Rev. Dr. BULLARD, St. Louis, U. S. — The following sketch, found in a Western paper, from its correspondent at the Frankfort Congress, is the only sketch we have seen of what the writer characterizes as "a very stirring speech in truly American western style."

We had, he said, less than 10,000 troops, enough for the great country of America, while he was surprised to learn that the beautiful and fertile, yet small and peaceable territory of Belgium, which he had passed through to come to this Congress, had a standing army of more than 100,000 men taxed upon the people. No such army would be tolerated in America; and he rejoiced that his country furnished an instance of a nation living in peace, and maintaining its liberties, without a standing army. He rejoiced at the abundant signs, that the day was coming when the scripture prophecy would be fulfilled, "when nations should beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks." The union of nations in commerce, the intercourse in travelling and visiting, encouraged by steam navigation and railroads, were hastening that day. Distant people were brought together as we are, as brothers instead of enemies. Look at the railroads all over the United States, and we are soon to have the great Pacific Railroad banding the continent; and we shall then be enabled to travel around the world in three months. Thus was the republican heart of America to beat around

the world. Then look at the intercourse by correspondence. The fact of the exemption of America from a standing army, and the blessings enjoyed there, were being carried to the homes of all the people of Europe.

He then alluded to the old castles of England, and to the serried towers of the Rhine, all speaking of a past age, of dark and bloody times, and which were testifying of better things already come; that the days of darkness and blood had passed away. He alluded to the Mexican war, to the injustice of it; that ministers had prayed that the names of those responsible for it might be made to rot with those of the wicked; that our nation had spent \$150,000,000 in that unjust war, and paid at least \$15,000,000 for territory which could have been purchased at half the rate before the war. He said that war was a system in which individual responsibility was lost, so that the persons engaged in it did not feel that they were doing wrong, however wrongful the war and its origin may have been. Thus it was with Gen. Gaines, one of the first of our Generals; he could go all through the country lecturing on the horrors of war. He was a peace man; so was Gen. Taylor; yet they would turn out at the command of the Government to fight, and feel themselves guiltless of the consequences.

HINTS FOR PEACE FROM GOVERNMENTAL DOCUMENTS.

CUSTOM, if not law, requires from the Executive, at the opening of every session of Congress, an exposé of what has been done in its various departments during the year, and of what is likely to be needed the ensuing year; and, as the Message of the President, and the Reports of his several Secretaries, generally present the clearest, fullest, and most reliable view we can get of our national policy and prospects, it would be well for every citizen to examine these annual documents with care. We are wont ourselves to do so; and, having pondered, and tried to analyze the documents of this kind lately put forth by the Executive, we would call attention to a few points which seem to us worthy of careful reflection.

I. WAR EXPENSES OF THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT. — The chief expenses of *our* preparations for war is found in the militia system, which has generally cost the country, in one way and another, twice or thrice as much as both the army and the navy; but the latter have come to absorb an enormous share of our national income, and threaten to rival ere long those of war-ridden Europe.

1. *The Army, or War Department.* — The following is an abstract of the estimates for the current fiscal year: —

PAY DEPARTMENT.			
For pay, subsistence, &c. for the Army,	-	-	\$2,807,127
For pay, subsistence, &c. for Military Academy, West Point,	-	-	90,593
For expenses of the office,	-	-	10,900
			<hr/> \$2,908,620
ORDNANCE BUREAU.			
Amount of estimates,	-	-	989,815
For expenses of the office,	-	-	9,500
			<hr/> 999,315